



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/782,412	02/13/2001	Gary P. Mousseau	1400-1072 D5	3123
54120 7590 09/15/2008				
RESEARCH IN MOTION				
ATTN: GLENDA WOLFE				
BUILDING 6, BRAZOS EAST, SUITE 100				
5000 RIVERSIDE DRIVE				
IRVING, TX 75039				
EXAMINER				
STRANGE, AARON N				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2153				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/782,412

Applicant(s)

MOUSSEAU ET AL.

Examiner

AARON STRANGE

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 65-78 and 97-118 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 65-78 and 97-118 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's amendments to claims 97-107 are sufficient to overcome the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 101. That rejection has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's amendments to claims 65, 97 and 108 are sufficient to overcome the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. That rejection has been withdrawn.
3. Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to claims 65-78 and 97-118 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 65, 97 and 108 (as currently amended) are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 90, 99 and 105 of copending Application No. 09/782,107. This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both applications contain the principal feature of common addressing.

Claims 65, 97 and 108 of the present application additionally include piecemeal delivery of messages, which is known in the art and taught by Eggleston (see rejection of claim 60, below), and 90, 99 and 105 of copending Application No. 09/782,107 additionally include encryption of the mail items prior to delivery. Encryption is also old and well known in the art.

Since both claim sets claim substantially the same invention, and the differences between them are old and well known, the claims are not patentably distinct and are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 65, 67-70, 89, 97, 99, 108 and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston et al. (US 5,958,006) in view of Tello et al. (US 6,381,634).

8. With regard to independent claim 65, Eggleston disclosed a method of redirecting e-mail messages and message attachments to a user of a mobile data communication device that is associated with a host system and communicates therewith, the user having a first e-mail address associated with the host system (users have email accounts)(col. 6, ll. 59-61) the method comprising:

receiving a data item (email) for the user at the host system (server 115) from a sender, the data item including an e-mail message addressed to the user and a message attachment (e.g. email message with attachment, Col 8, lines 30-37);

redirecting at least a portion of the e-mail message from the host system to the mobile data communication device via a wireless network (e.g. when the user has implemented a filter and only part of the message is sent to the user, see inter alia Col 3, lines 23-26 and Col 10, lines 10-32);

receiving a first command message from the mobile data communication device at the host system requesting more of the data item (i.e. sends the request after receiving partial or summary data for more of the message or all of the message, see inter alia Col 3, lines 29-34 or Col 10, line 57 – Col 11, line 4);

redirecting the message attachment from the host system to the mobile data communication device via the wireless network in response to first command message (i.e. when the user requests all of the message or full transfer of the message, the attachment will also be sent to the user's mobile device, again see inter alia Col 3, lines 29-34 or Col 10, line 57 – Col 11, line 4);

receiving from the mobile data communication device a reply e-mail message (user replies to a message)(col. 3, ll. 35-56); and

sending the reply e-mail message to the sender (col. 3, ll. 46-47).

However, Eggleston fails to specifically disclose that the message is redirected to a second address associated with the user or that the reply message's originating address is configured to be the first address.

Tello discloses a similar system for forwarding e-mail messages from a host system associated with a first e-mail address to a second system associated with a second e-mail address. Tello teaches receiving an e-mail message at a host machine (ISP mail server) associated with a first e-mail address (well-known-name value 505)(col. 4, ll. 43-48; col. 5, ll. 29-33), and redirecting the message to a second address associated with the recipient (well-known-name-value is converted into literal address for redirection)(col. 5, ll. 33-39). Tello further discloses that the user's well-known name address remains unchanged, even if the literal address associated with it changes (col. 5, ll. 56-67), permitting e-mail address portability (col. 5, ll. 58-60). The combined teachings of Eggleston and Tello would have taught and/or suggested using the first

address (the well-known name value) as the return address in any reply messages, since it would have maintained the portability of the address, permitting later communications in response to the reply message to reach the user via the SCP system, even if the user's literal address changed in the meantime.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to permit forwarding of messages to a second address associated with the user, and use the first address as the originating address of any subsequent reply messages, to maintain portability of the user's e-mail address and ensure that additional messages in the conversation are sent to the user's current location.

9. With regard to claim 67, Eggleston disclosed:

Configuring one or more redirection events at the host system (e.g. user sets up a filter, see inter alia Col 8, lines 14-55);

detecting that a redirection event has occurred at the host system (i.e. an email passes the filter criteria) and generating a redirection trigger (required internally in the system such that the system invokes the process or procedure to actually forward the message); and

In response to the redirection trigger, redirecting at least a portion of the e-mail message from the host system to the mobile data communication device (i.e. forwarding the message when it passes the filter criteria).

10. With regard to claims 68 and 69, Eggleston disclosed the external redirection event is a message from the mobile data communication device to start the redirection step (i.e. user enables the filters from the mobile device, Col 9, lines 32-43). Eggleston also disclosed the internal event includes a calendar alarm (calendar activates a filter profile, Col 9, lines 42-43).

11. With regard to claim 70, Eggleston disclosed the mobile data communication device is one of a hand-held wireless paging computer, a wirelessly-enabled palm-top computer, a mobile telephone with data message capabilities and a wirelessly-enabled laptop computer (Col 4, lines 11-13).

12. Claims 97, 99, 108 and 110 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 65 and 70, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

13. Claims 71-73, 100-102 and 111-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Eggleston et al. (US 5,958,006) in view of Tello et al. (US 6,381,634) further in view of Official Notice.

14. With regard to claims 71-73, while the system disclosed by Eggleston in view of Tello shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to

disclose that the attachment is one of a word processing, audio or video attachment, or whether the attachment is one that can be processed by the mobile device.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that word processing files, audio files, and video files were all old and well known types of email attachments at the time the invention was made, and that word processing type files could be processed (displayed) by mobile devices while video files could not, due to limitations on processing capabilities at the time.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to permit these attachments to be received and processed by the system taught by Eggleston and Tello, since they were commonly accepted email attachments at the time the invention was made.

15. Claims 100-102 and 11-113 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 71-73, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

16. Claims 66, 74-78, 98, 103-107, 109 and 114-118 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by Eggleston et al. (US 5,958,006 in view of Tello et al. (US 6,381,634) further in view of Official Notice further in view of Kikinis (US 5,964,833).

17. With regard to claims 66 and 74, while the system disclosed by Eggleston and Tello shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose receiving a second command message from the mobile data communication device at the host system to send the message attachment to an external device stored in a user profile and redirecting the message attachment from the host system to the external device in response to the second command message.

In a similar messaging system Kikinis disclosed a system that allows users to forward email attachments to various preprogrammed external devices such as a fax machine (Kikinis Col 4, lines 50-56). By allowing users to forward attachments using other devices rather than just email, Kikinis allows users to communicate easier and with more people. For instance an external device such a fax machine may be more convenient for some users or the only form of communication available to other users who are unable to receive email at a particular location.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify Eggleston's system to allow users to forward attachments to other preprogrammed external devices, as disclosed by Kikinis, so that users can communicate with other people by using different means rather than just email and thus communicate with more people.

18. With regard to claim 75, Kikinis disclosed the external device is one of a fax machine (Col 4, lines 50-56).

19. With regard to claim 76, Kikinis disclosed the step of decoupling the message attachment from the e-mail message (i.e. Kikinis only sends the attachment to a fax machine which requires decouple the message attachment from the e-mail message).

20. With regard to claims 77 and 78, Kikinis disclosed the step of storing the e-mail message and message attachment in a message store at the host system (Col 4, lines 38-48).

21. Claims 98, 103-107, 109 and 114-118 are rejected under the same rationale as claims 66, 74-78, since they recite substantially identical subject matter. Any differences between the claims do not result in patentably distinct claims and all of the limitations are taught by the above cited art.

Conclusion

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AARON STRANGE whose telephone number is (571)272-3959. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Glenton B. Burgess/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2153

Application/Control Number: 09/782,412
Art Unit: 2153

Page 12

/A. S./
Examiner, Art Unit 2153